



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by it. We are led from the perusal of this volume to see afresh that Romanticism was a mingling of many separate influences, and that its results were as fruitful as its origin. Poetry was enriched not only by the introduction of new forms, but by new subjects and motives drawn from Oriental as well as Romantic literature: theology was enlarged upon the ethical side and made human, and saved in part from the formalism of a lifeless creed and a state church; FICHTE's theory of science and SCHELLING's mode of contemplating nature came opportunely both to define as well as to spiritualize. But when we ask ourselves what one of all these influences Romanticism originated, we must admit its debt to those who cannot be numbered with the Romantic School. HERDER had preceded in his study of the popular songs of all nations, WINCKELMANN and GOETHE had gone before in an enthusiasm for ancient art, and GOETHE had begun his contributions to mediæval art; the English had already led in the fruitful field of Oriental study: and the interpretation of the philosophy of government and of the rights of man had received a powerful interpretation in the events of the French Revolution. Romanticism as an impulse and not a creed had defects, grave defects, on the ethical side and with humiliating consequences in the lives of some of its greatest leaders: it became formless and fantastic in the exuberant fancy of its later followers, but the lives of its earlier advocates show an industry and a scientific method as remarkable as their enthusiasm. This volume will form a permanent and indispensable part of the material for the study of the Romantic School and the literary history of the period.

W. T. HEWETT.

Cornell University.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

A Compendious French Grammar by A. HJALMAR EDGREN, Professor of Modern Languages and Sanskrit in the State University of Nebraska. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1890. 12mo, pp. lxvi, 293.

WHEN outlining French pronunciation, a grammarian may follow one of two systems. He may wisely, especially if he is not a

Frenchman, do away with investigation of his own into the domain of French sounds, and, appealing to the most authoritative sources may embody in his own treatise the clearest and simplest statements he there finds concerning French pronunciation. Or, if he is a phonetician and has kept pace with the progress of his subject, he may choose for the basis of his practical as well as theoretical exposition of pronunciation, the physiological processes involved in the production of French and English sounds. A careful comparison, on this basis, of the corresponding sounds in the respective languages, would bring out the greater or less prominence that is given to certain speech-organs in the case of each; would go far towards imparting a correct knowledge of their distinctive peculiarities, niceties and difficulties, and would confer immense advantages on teachers and students alike, in preventing both the inculcation and the acquisition of a false or faulty pronunciation.

The system followed by Prof. EDGREN is not quite clear, and his theory and practice show decidedly weak points. French *a* is given two sounds (p. 10): 1. nearly that of *a* in English '*father*' (not quite so deep). 2. more open, approaching that of *a* in '*at*,' *á* in Webster's *ask* representing the sound quite well. The former occurs when *a* is long, except before two consonants.—Ex. (1) *âme*, *base*, *bât*, *âge*; —(2) *carnaval*, *patte*, *table*, *tâcher*, *là*.—With regard to the depth of French *a* cf. BEYER, '*Französische Phonetik*,' p. 19: "*Es liegt wohl eine Schwebung tiefer als das südostengl. a in father.*" To call the second sound of *a*, a more open sound, is to go contrary to the assertion of phoneticians. They have observed that in the utterance of the *a*-sound the angle formed by the jaws is greater, for example, in *tâcher* than in *tucher*. And the use of the word *tâcher* to illustrate the second sound of *a* is an obvious error. Again, the sound of *a* in *father* is said to occur when *a* is long, *except before two consonants*. Are we to understand that the sound of *a* in *lasse*, *tasse*, *cadre*, etc., is not that of long *a*?

French *é*, we are told (p. 12), sounds "almost" like *e* in '*they*.' Why not state that the sound of "ey" in '*they*' is a diphthong

[ē + ɪ], and that the French *ê* has its exact equivalent in the first sound *ê*?—Page 12, “*ê*, *ê* when long have almost the sound of *e* in ‘*ere*’ or of *ei* in ‘*heir*’ . . . and when short of *e* in ‘*let*.’” Could Prof. EDGREN have given us instances in which *ê* is short and has the sound of *e* in ‘*let*’?—*Suave* is said (p. 15) to be pronounced *seu ave*, and so of other vowel combinations beginning with *u*. *Mon ami* should be pronounced *mo-nami* rather than *mō-n’ami*;—the correct pronunciation of *monsieur* is *mosieu* rather than *me-sieu*.—Taking for granted that French nasal sounds have no exact English equivalents (pp. v, 16), Prof. EDGREN has left that most important part of French pronunciation without any illustrations whatsoever. The important *gn* sound has not been clearly described; the *n*-sound blends with the following *y*-sound not *almost* but entirely, and the two form one single palatal nasal.

No average school grammar can lay claim to completeness, yet since the First Part of this work is intended for separate use, we might well have expected to find in it a few more details on the articles, the partitive sign, the position and comparison of adjectives, together with tables of the cardinal and ordinal numerals; and it would have needed little space to point out the frequent use in French of the definite article instead of the possessive adjective, its repetition before every noun, the rule of the demonstrative antecedent before relative pronoun, the use of *ce* and *il* with *être*, and the few peculiarities of impersonal verbs. A more serious defect is found in the make-up of the exercises, which lack a judicious intermingling of affirmative, negative and interrogative sentences, in fact, up to exercise xvi we have only five interrogative forms. The sentences, as a rule, are too disconnected and their meaning too indifferent to command dignified and scholarly attention on the part of students. The following sentences are *sui generis* and not likely to be found outside of these exercises.

Je donne de bonne eau à la sœur du bon homme; je parle des bons frères et des bonnes sœurs; je donne trop de pain et de viande à la sœur; lesquelles de ces filles sont bonnes? (!); l’époux à qui elle pense est malade; je défends qu’il reçoive mes coraux; il ne parle plus de cette montagne; si vous déclarez que ce garçon est bon, je l’accepte.

The English exercises are open to the same criticism: *I speak of the butter, the soup, and the water; I speak of my brother’s apples; I give meat to the girl’s mother, and to the son.* A certain number, however, of dull, meaningless sentences may be inseparable from grammatical exercises; at any rate, it is far easier to criticize poor ones than to evolve better ones, as any one who has ever undertaken it will be most ready to admit.—In placing pronominal adjectives and pronouns on the same page and face to face (pp. xxvi, xxviii, xxix) Prof. EDGREN has made an important improvement on various other grammars; students will thus get a better grasp and a clearer comprehension of these intricate chapters.

Page xxvii, it is wrong to call *mon, ton, son* feminine forms;—Page xlv, note 1, instead of “final *-e* becomes *è*, e. g. *aimè-je*,” should read: “final *-e* becomes *é*.” (The same error occurs in p. 78).—P. lv: the circumflex accent of *dû* is only incidental to distinguish *dû* from *du*; it is a remnant of a former *e* as in *deû, veû, eû, meûr*, which words are unsystematically spelled *dû, vu, eu, mûr*.—P. lv ‘and they all (save *pourvoir*) drop their *oi*,’ add, in the parenthesis, *prevoir*.

More credit is due Prof. EDGREN for the Second Part of his grammar. He has evidently made a laborious and conscientious effort to present us with a satisfactory work; in particular, chapters xx and xxi (as “French Verse” and the “Relation of Anglo-French and French Words”) will furnish students with useful information when more complete treatises are out of their reach. Concerning the copious examples accompanying the syntactical rules, the student is recommended by the author to learn them *one and all*; yet some of them are scarcely suitable to serve as models:

Espérance, courage c’est tout qu’il nous faut (p. 124); le fer de suède est bon (p. 128); une douzaine d’œufs (p. 128); il est âgé de trois ans (p. 129); il donne de l’argent à moi (p. 149); il obéit à moi et à vous (p. 149); le garçon est bon et les filles sont aussi bonnes (p. 134) (!); les filles ont soif, donnez-leur de l’eau (p. 150); j’entends que vous voulez rester (p. 197); il sait se taire, c’est bon (p. 154).

Prof. EDGREN lays claim to innovations in the exposition of the irregular verbs. Innovations

are not without danger, and in a grammar they should mean improvement. My apprehension is that students will bestow very little attention upon §§ 156 to 161, only to be confronted later by a mere alphabetical list, unwisely encumbered by forms such as *-cevoir*, *-cire*, *-clure*, *-crire*, *-fire*, *-frir*, etc. But let us suppose that §§ 156 to 161 have been thoroughly studied; after having tried to master two divisions of irregular verbs, with some fifteen groups and sub-groups (not counting exceptions), the student is refreshed by being told that concerning *courir*, *mourir*, *acquérir*, *tenir*, *recevoir*, *devoir*, *mouvoir*, *pouvoir*, *pleuvoir*, *savoir*, *falloir*, *valoir*, *vouloir*, *voir*, *asseoir*, other peculiarities are best studied under each verb!

In pointing out Latin secondary forms through which French verbs are derived, Prof. EDGREN lacks uniformity: if *choir* is from CADÈRE through CADÈRE, *naître* from NASCERE for NASCI, so are *-cevoir*, *mentir*, *mourir*, *partir*, from -CAPÈRE, *mentire* (not *MENTIRI*), *morire* (not *MORIRI*), *partire* (not *PARTIRI*). There is no reason why some of these peculiarities should be pointed out and the others not.—P. 84, *conquérir* and *reconquérir* are said to be used only in inf., past part., and pret. On what authority are the modes and tenses of these two verbs thus cut down? The *rr* of the future of *acquérir* is owing, it is said, to the loss of *i*. Not so. *Acquerrai* is from the old inf. *acquerre*+*ai*.—Under *asseoir* the form *assièrai* should be placed first, as it is the one more generally used.—The *rr* of *courrai*, we are told again, is owing to the loss of *i*; but *courrai* is from *courre*+*ai*. This old form of the infinitive still survives as a hunting term and especially in the phrase *chasse à courre*.—The *é* of *écrire* is said (p. 91) to be “simply euphonic”; this is not quite accurate; *é* here represents two elements, euphonic *e* and the *s* of *scribo*, the loss of which has been in a sense supplied by the acute accent, consequently *é* is partly euphonic and partly etymological.—The circumflex accent of *crû* (p. 89) is not merely for the sake of differentiation. The future of *falloir* should be regularly derived from old Fr. *faldre*, *faudre*, (FALLERE) and to speak of the loss of the *oi* of *-oir* is erroneous. Under *férer* the form *fêru* might have been given, as it is found in Modern French writers (e. g., *fêru d’amour*);—The *qu* of SEQUERE (for

SEQUI) is made to equal *v*: but it is the *u* of *qu* which becomes *v*, and *q* is softened into the palatal sound *i*.—“*Seoir* ‘fit’: only *séant*; past part. *sis*; pres. ind. *il sied*; fut. -cond. *il siéra* (*il*).” Such a statement is incomplete. *Seoir* has at present two very distinct meanings: ‘sit, be located,’ and ‘fit’; when meaning ‘sit’ the verb is found with such forms as: *sieds* (-toi), *seoir*, *séant*, *sis sise*; and when meaning ‘fit’: *sied sièent*, *seyait*, *seyaient*, *siéra sièront*, *sièrait sièraient*, *séant* or *seyant*. *Sis* is never the past part. of *seoir* meaning ‘fit.’—Among the compound forms, a few omissions may be noted; viz., *a(d)venir*, *éconduire*, *prévaloir*, *messeoir*. Notwithstanding the above criticism of some of the historical points discussed, it must still be said that in the treatment of such questions, this grammar is fuller and more trustworthy than any other practical grammar of French in the English language.

The book is very satisfactorily printed, and typographical errors are, on the whole, few; only some fifteen or twenty, of more or less importance, have been noticed in the course of a careful perusal; cf. *rouvnir* for *rouvrir*, *d* for *dé* p. 88; *œfs* for *œufs*, p. 128; *s’l* for *s’il*, p. 152; *demandies* for *demandiez*, p. 153; *vacanes* for *vacances*, p. 154; *belie* for *believe*, p. 170; *etonne* (*é*) p. 176; *ecouter* (*é*) p. 203; *a* (*à*) 206; *emotion* (*é*) p. 210; *ci-gisent* for *ci-gisaient*, p. 93; *remplit* (*i*) p. xxxix. But who is the grammarian referred to in the preface (p. vi) under the name of “Cayer”? CHASSANG and BRACHET are names familiar enough to suggest themselves readily in place of “Chassung” and “Braccet” (same page), but “Cayer” might too successfully “darken counsel” as to the identity of the distinguished grammarian C. AVER.

JOS. A. FONTAINE.

Bryn Mawr College.

OLD ENGLISH PHONOLOGY.

Synopsis of Old English Phonology, being a Systematic Account of Old English Vowels and Consonants and their Correspondences in the Cognate Languages, by A. L. MAYHEW, M. A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Mr. MAYHEW’s book is an admirable compilation,—admirable for its science, its method, and its convenience. The typographical de-